



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/605,794	06/27/2000	Osman Abdoul Ismael	P2651C	6721

32658 7590 03/10/2003
HOGAN & HARTSON LLP
ONE TABOR CENTER, SUITE 1500
1200 SEVENTEEN ST.
DENVER, CO 80202

EXAMINER

BULLOCK JR, LEWIS ALEXANDER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 03/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application N .

09/605,794

Applicant(s)

ISMAEL ET AL.

Examiner

Lewis A. Bullock, Jr.

Art Unit

2126

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 19 February 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:


Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-18.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____



ST. JOHN COURTENAY III
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Part of Paper No. 15

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's request is unpersuasive. Applicant argues that the combination does not teach the client object being configured to identify methods of the target object and support manipulation of properties of the target object. The examiner disagrees. Hill teaches the proxy is an object that implements the same interface as the interface to the object (col. 7, lines 1-7; col. 13, lines 32-37). Therefore, both proxy and object have the same method names for handling calls but different implementation of what that handling entails. Hill also teaches that when a client wants to call a GetCell method of a target object it calls the GetCell method of the proxy which forwards the call to the target object (col. 7, line 64 - col. 8, line 20). Other references such as Hollberg mention that the proxy performs set functions for manipulation of other objects (col. 8, lines 43-45; col. 7, lines 21-26). The claim at best mention a client object is configured to identify the methods of the target object which are remotely accessible and support manipulation of properties to the target object. Since the proxy and the object implement the same interface having the same method names, wherein the proxy receives and sends a message of the method invocation to the target object and both the proxy and target are remote from one another, the proxy identifies the methods of the target which are remotely accessible. In addition, since the proxy allows for manipulation of the target or real objects, they allow for the manipulation of properties of the object. Applicant then argues that the combination does not teach the registering the target object and a network adapter for a network protocol with a framework at the remote station. The examiner disagrees. OMG, cited by Applicant, teaches target objects (object implementations) select interfaces to ORB dependent services by choice of an object adapter (pg. 34, first paragraph) and that ORBs support multiple protocols (pg. 37, section 3.2). Therefore, the combination adequately teaches the step of registering the target object and a network adapter for a network protocol with a framework at the remote station. Therefore, the rejection will be maintained.